



2026:AHC:30158-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION (PIL) No. - 352 of 2026

Muhammad Yasha

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of Up And 11 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Maya Ram
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	Jagdish Pathak (SC), Azad Rai, Satyvendra Singh Yadav

Chief Justice's Court

HON'BLE ARUN BHANSALI, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE KSHITIJ SHAILENDRA, J.

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking a direction to the respondent nos. 2 to 5 to delete the names of voters from the voters list of Tehsil Sadar, District Prayagraj.

2. Learned counsel appearing for respondent nos. 10, 11 and 12 submits that the petitioner with the same counsel had filed Writ-C No. 44416 of 2025 which has been dismissed by the learned Single Judge on 07.01.2026 by passing a speaking order, however, the said fact has not been disclosed in the present PIL, which has been filed claiming identical relief.

3. When counsel for the petitioner who himself had filed Writ-C No. 44416 of 2025, was confronted with the said order, except for cutting a sorry figure, he had no answer to the said aspect.

4. The learned Single Judge, dealing with the issue raised, inter alia observed as under:

“1. Heard Sri Maya Ram, learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Standing Counsel for the State respondents and Sri Azad Rai, learned counsel for the respondent Gram Sabha.

2. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking a direction upon the authorities to delete the name of voters from voter list from serial no.907 to 932 and 1063 to 1112 of Polling Booths 116 & 306, Prathmik Pathshala, Hatwa, Tehsil Sadar, Prayagraj.

3. Though the petition has been filed for deleting the names of voters included in the voter list but they have not been impleaded as party respondent in the

present petition. Moreover, no objection in Form-4 as contemplated under rule 10 of the Uttar Pradesh Panchayat Raj (Registration of Electors) Rules, 1994 has been filed by the petitioner before the appropriate authority i.e. Assistant Electoral Registration Officer.

4. In view of the aforesaid, the present petitioner appears to be misconceived and requires no interference by this Court. Writ petition being devoid of merit is, accordingly, dismissed.”

5. Once the petition seeking similar relief has been dismissed on merit, filing of the present PIL is a gross abuse of the process of the Court. The suppression by the petitioner and by the counsel both cannot be permitted.

6. Consequently, the petition is dismissed with a exemplary cost of Rs.50,000/-.

7. The cost shall be recovered from the petitioner. The Registrar (Compliance) is directed to ensure the recovery of the cost.

(Kshitij Shailendra,J.) (Arun Bhansali,CJ.)

February 11, 2026
RK/Sazia